

On the role of extrinsic noise in microRNA-mediated bimodal gene expression

Marco Del Giudice^{*,1}, Stefano Bo², Silvia Grigolon^{o,3} and Carla Bosia^{*,o,4}

¹*Department of Applied Science and Technology, Politecnico di Torino,
Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, I-10129 Torino, Italy*

²*Nordita, Royal Institute of Technology and Stockholm University,
Roslagstullsbacken 23, SE-10691 Stockholm, Sweden*

³*The Francis Crick Institute, 1 Midland Road, London NW1 1AT, UK*

⁴*Human Genetics Foundation, via Nizza 52, I-10126 Torino, Italy**

Several studies pointed out the relevance of extrinsic noise in molecular networks in shaping cell decision making and differentiation. Interestingly, bimodal distributions of gene expression levels, that may be a feature of phenotypic differentiation, are a common phenomenon in gene expression data. The modes of the distribution often correspond to different physiological states of the system. In this work we address the role of extrinsic noise in shaping bimodal gene distributions in the context of microRNA (miRNA)-mediated regulation, both with stochastic modelling and simulations. MiRNAs are small noncoding RNA molecules that downregulate the expression of their target mRNAs. The titrative nature of the interaction is sufficient to induce bimodal distributions of the targets. We study the fluctuating miRNA transcription case to probe the effects of extrinsic noise on the system. We show that (i) bimodal target distributions can be obtained exploiting a noisy environment even in case of small miRNA-target interaction strength, (ii) an increase in the extrinsic noise shifts the range of target transcription rates that allow bimodality towards higher values, (iii) the protein half-life may buffer bimodal mRNA preventing its distribution from becoming bimodal and that (iv) in a noisy environment different targets may cross-regulate each other's bimodal distribution when competing for a shared pool of miRNAs even if the miRNA regulation is small.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed: marco.delgiudice@polito.it, carla.bosia@hugef-torino.org

^oThese authors contributed equally to this work.

INTRODUCTION

Environmental fluctuations can be source of noise in molecular networks, usually referred to as extrinsic noise [1, 2]. Extrinsic noise, together with intrinsic fluctuations due to the probabilistic nature of chemical reactions, shapes gene expression and thus cell decision making and differentiation. Bimodality in gene expression, i.e. the differential expression of genes in relation to phenotypic differentiation, is a common phenomenon observed in expression data ranging from cancer to immune cells [3, 4]. The two peaks of the distribution are usually associated with different physiological states of the system, such as a normal and a disease state or different cancer subtypes [5–8]. MicroRNAs (miRNAs), small molecules of non-coding RNA, may induce bimodality in the expression of their targets, not necessarily driven by specific genetic circuits (such as toggle-switches [9]), but simply due to peculiar titrative interactions [10].

MiRNAs recognize their mRNA targets through Watson-Crick base pairing to ~ 7 nucleotide long sequences. Once bound to the target, they can both enhance the instability of that mRNA or decrease its translation and different levels of interaction miRNA-target can be achieved by different number of miRNAs [11–13]. Theoretical predictions together with in vitro single cell experiments suggested that bimodality in the expression level of miRNA targets can be achieved with a high miRNA-target interaction strength [10, 14], that is a high number of miRNA binding sites (bs) per target. As long as a miRNA molecule is bound to the target, such target cannot be translated. It is then possible to define a threshold for the mRNA transcription rate such that below the threshold all the mRNA target molecules are bound to miRNAs and above the threshold there are molecules of mRNA free for translation [14–16]. In proximity to the threshold the number of both free miRNAs and targets is small, their fluctuations are highly coupled and a small fluctuation in their amount of molecules may lead the system from the “bound” to the “unbound” state [10, 14, 16]. If the interaction strength between miRNA and target is high, then the transition from the bound to the unbound state is sharp: close to the threshold, simply because of intrinsic fluctuations in the amount of both miRNA and target, part of the targets will be bound to the miRNA and part unbound for the same transcription rate.

MiRNAs are predicted to regulate more than 60% of our genome and their action is combinatorial, that is every single miRNA can regulate several targets and one target can

be regulated by different miRNAs [13, 17]. Since by modulating the expression of target transcripts they affect many different signaling pathways and cellular processes [18, 19], the alteration of their expression levels may contribute to tumor development and metastatization [20–23]. It is nowadays well established that multiple cell cycle regulators are controlled by miRNAs, whose regulation could be in turn cell cycle-dependent [24–27]. The expression level of miRNAs may thus change with the cell cycle progression, and there are indeed miRNAs differentially expressed depending on the particular phase of the cell cycle [28]. This means that in a population of cells heterogeneous with respect to the cell cycle, as could be the case of cancer cells no longer in a quiescent state, the amount of miRNAs can fluctuate from cell to cell. This introduces an extra source of noise in the system besides the intrinsic stochasticity of chemical reactions involving gene transcription, translation and regulation.

Here we analyze, both analytically and with simulations, how this extrinsic source of noise influences miRNA-mediated regulation. We show how a distribution of miRNA transcription rates reshapes the threshold between miRNA and target and defines a wider region of bimodality for the target. The same bimodal phenotype can be observed both at a “population level” through the non-homogeneous miRNA amount in the population of cells or at “single cell level” in case the miRNAs transcription rates do not fluctuate and their interaction with the target is high. We show as well that the bimodal miRNA target distributions can be obtained exploiting the noisy environment even in case of a small miRNA-target interaction strength. If the miRNA target is protein coding, the protein half-life can buffer the bimodal mRNA preventing its distribution from becoming bimodal. This suggests that bimodal distribution at the level of mRNA may correspond to specific single phenotype at the protein level.

In case of multiple targets competing for the same pool of miRNAs a change in the expression level of one gene can alter the expression of the others [29]. The different target genes act as sponges for the miRNA molecules and may sequester them from the environment. As a result, the overexpression or downregulation of one of the targets can lead respectively to an increase or decrease in the level of expression of the other competitors. The intensity of such cross-regulation depends on the distance from the threshold of quasi-equimolarity between miRNAs and targets [14, 16]. This suggests that, if one target has a bimodal distribution, such bimodality may be influenced by the expression levels of the

other miRNA competitors. We show that different targets may cross-regulate each other's bimodal distributions even in case of small interaction strength with the shared miRNA.

RESULTS

Stochastic model for miRNA-target interaction with extrinsic noise

Models of microRNA-mediated circuits have been the subject of several studies over the past years [15, 30, 31]. Hereby we will refer to one of the simplest ways of accounting for microRNA-driven inhibition, depicted in Figure 1. The molecular species involved in this circuit are miRNAs (S), target mRNAs (R) and proteins (P), result of the translation of the target mRNA.

In the following, we shall assume miRNAs and mRNAs to be transcribed from independent genes. For simplicity we neglect all the intermediate reactions leading to the synthesis of miRNAs and mRNAs, therefore assuming they are produced at rates k_S and k_R respectively. The miRNA transcription rate k_S can either be constant or fluctuate. We shall study the fluctuating transcription case to probe the effects of extrinsic noise on the system. miRNAs and mRNAs can also be degraded by the action of specialized enzymes. Hereby, we assume these reactions to be governed by mass-action law with rates g_S and g_R . The associated molecular reactions read:



miRNAs act as post-transcriptional regulatory elements, by binding the target mRNAs in a complex that can be successively degraded. Such interaction between miRNAs and mRNAs is quantified by the effective parameter g , which takes into account both the strength of the coupling miRNA-target and the number of miRNA binding sites on the target [15]. The formation of miRNA-mRNA complex reads:



While the mRNAs are always degraded due to the titrative interaction, the miRNAs can be recycled with probability α in the following way:



Whenever the mRNAs are not bound to miRNAs, they can be translated into proteins with translation rate k_P and, as assumed for the other molecular species, proteins can be as well degraded with rate g_P , i.e.:



From now on, we define as “intrinsic noise” the fluctuations due to the stochasticity of the chemical reactions with constant rates and as “extrinsic noise” those due to the fluctuating miRNA transcription rate.

The system can be described by the probability distribution $P(S, R, P, t|k)$ of observing S molecules of miRNA, R molecules of mRNA and P proteins at time t given a set of parameters k . This probability distribution follows the same master equation presented in [14] that can be either solved numerically or at the steady state with some approximations. If the parameters fluctuate, in order to obtain the full distribution at the steady state $P_{ss}(S, R, P)$ one has to take into account such fluctuations. This can be achieved by Bayes’ theorem, which states that $P(S, R, P) = \int P(k)P(S, R, P|k)dk$. For the sake of simplicity, we will assume a Gaussian distribution for the miRNA transcription rate k_S centered around $\langle k_S \rangle$. We shall vary the variance of the distribution to investigate the impact of various levels of extrinsic noise. To obtain the steady state distribution $P(S, R, P|k_S)$ conditioned on a specific miRNA transcription rate we performed a system size expansion. The marginal distribution $P(S, R, P)$ is then found by using Bayes’s theorem (see Materials and Methods for details). We applied the same approach when considering two targets interacting with the same miRNA. In this case the conditional distribution is $P(S, R_1, R_2, P_1, P_2|k_S)$.

Single cell versus population-induced bimodality

The binding and unbinding reactions between miRNA and target give rise to threshold effects in condition of quasi-equimolarity between miRNA and target [15, 29], see Figure 2B. The threshold is defined in terms of miRNA and mRNA transcription rates as $k_S^* = \alpha k_R^*$ [15]. When the miRNA transcription rate is greater than its threshold value, $k_S > k_S^*$, then the system is below the threshold with respect to the target. This means that most of the

mRNA target molecules are bound to miRNAs and the target is not translated. In case of pure intrinsic noise, above the threshold the mean amount of target not bound to miRNAs increases linearly with its transcription rate [15]. In proximity of the threshold the target can jump from the bound to the unbound state and viceversa. The interaction strength g between miRNA and target controls how often the mRNAs bind to the miRNAs. If g is high, the target can last in the repressed state for a time long enough to give rise to bimodal target distributions which appear for a narrow range of the target transcription rate k_R [14]. Such bimodality can be viewed as a single cell phenomenon: every single cell can jump from the bound (i.e. repressed) to the unbound (i.e. unrepressed) target state so that at a given time t part of the population will be in one state and part in the other, see Figure 1B.

In presence of extrinsic noise, the miRNA transcription rate is not the same for every cell of the population and we model this by randomly drawing it from a gaussian distribution. Consider the case of a miRNA transcription distribution with fixed average $\langle k_S \rangle$. When the mRNA transcription rate (k_R) is very low, the average miRNA transcription rate is much larger than the threshold value ($\langle k_S \rangle \gg \alpha k_R$) and most of the picked transcription rate k_S will be larger than the threshold value and belong to the parameter range for which the targets are all bound to the miRNAs. For larger k_R , approaching the threshold, values of k_S extracted from the left-tail will correspond to the case with some unbound targets. After the threshold, as $\langle k_S \rangle < \alpha k_R$, the majority of the drawn k_S will belong to the unbound state with the right-tail of the distribution sampling the all bound region. The presence of rates above and below the threshold across the population can give rise to a bimodal distribution in the number of free targets, see Figure 2. The higher the extrinsic noise, the larger the range of target transcription rates for which bimodality is present and the greater the separation between the two phenotypes (bound and unbound targets), see Figure 3. Even for high values of k_R the fraction of randomly picked k_S that brings the system in the bound state is not negligible and forms a visible peak in the distribution. The bimodal distribution is in this case given by the superposition of monomodal distributions obtained for different k_S , weighted by the probability $P(k_S)$, see Figure 4. Such bimodality can be viewed as a population effect: there is a population of cells heterogeneous with respect to the miRNA transcription rate, so that for some of them the target is always below the threshold, for others is always above and some of them jump from one state to the other, see Figure 1D.

A noisy environment can compensate for low miRNA-target interaction to obtain bimodal distribution

Consider the phase diagram for the bimodality in Figure 3. The interaction strength between miRNA and target g affects the range of values of k_R in which the bimodality is present. In case of pure intrinsic noise such range is narrow, present only for high interactions and increases when increasing g . Since in this case the bimodality is a single cell effect, only those cells having the target highly interacting with the miRNA have the chance to experience the repressed and unrepressed state when k_R is close to its threshold value.

Adding some extrinsic noise relaxes the constraint on the interaction strength. Indeed, in this case even those cells whose target lowly interacts with the miRNA will have the chance to be in the repressed or unrepressed state depending on the particular miRNA transcription rate. Figure 5 shows how it is possible to have similar bimodal distributions either increasing the miRNA-target interaction strength (blue histogram) or increasing the extrinsic noise (orange histogram) with respect to a reference case with pure intrinsic noise and low miRNA-target interaction (black line). The extrinsic noise and the miRNA-target interaction strength act at a similar level with respect to bimodality, where a higher extrinsic noise can compensate for a low interaction strength (small number of miRNA binding sites on the target) in order to obtain two differentially expressed phenotypes.

The phase diagram in Figure 3 suggests as well that in case of low target transcription rate, increasing the extrinsic noise reshapes a well defined bimodal distribution into a distribution with a continuum of different states. In this case, the higher the extrinsic noise, the larger the number of cells with all targets bound to miRNAs.

Protein half-life can buffer bimodal phenotypes

The mean amount of target protein is proportional to the amount of its unrepressed mRNA, that is those molecules not bound to miRNAs and free for the translation. If the protein is long-lived (low degradation rate g_P), the range of values of target transcription that allows bimodality on proteins is smaller than the mRNA one. This suggests that it is possible to have a single phenotype on proteins and two different phenotypes on its mRNA at the same time. In this case the protein distribution is produced by the unrepressed peak

of the mRNA and the protein half-life plays the role of a buffer for the mRNA bimodal distribution. Long-lived proteins accumulate in time and as a consequence the unrepressed state is amplified while the repressed one is hidden. If the protein is short lived (high degradation rate g_P) with a half-life comparable to that of the mRNA, then the regions of bimodality for protein and transcript coincide. Extrinsic noise amplifies the range of values of target transcription that give rise to bimodal phenotypes. Increasing the extrinsic noise, the bimodality on proteins appears for increasingly larger ranges of target transcription rate. Figure 6 (left panel) shows the mRNA distribution in case of low miRNA-target interaction and some extrinsic noise (blue histogram). The corresponding protein distributions can be either bimodal (yellow histogram) or monomodal (blue histogram) depending on the protein half-life.

Interplay between different targets increases the stability of bimodal phenotypes

Consider a minimal model with two targets, R_1 and R_2 , competing for the same miRNA S , see Figure 7. We investigate what is effect on target R_1 of an increase in the expression of target R_2 either with or without extrinsic noise. When increasing the transcription rate k_{R_2} of target R_2 , the threshold of the target R_1 shifts towards lower expression levels: the miRNAs are indeed sponged away by R_2 and a lower amount of R_1 is needed to overcome the threshold.

In case of pure intrinsic noise, if R_1 has a high interaction strength g_1 with the miRNA, then the range of bimodality shifts towards lower expression levels as well. The width of the range of R_1 bimodality is determined by the interaction strength g_2 of the target R_2 with the miRNA. If $g_2 \gg g_1$, then the miRNAs are sponged away by the second target with such a high frequency that the net effect is a reduction in the amount of miRNAs available to target R_1 . This entails a shift not only of the k_{R_1} threshold value but also of the range of bimodality. If $g_2 < g_1$, the second target R_2 interacts with low frequency with the miRNA, R_1 is slightly derepressed and the net effect on its bimodal distribution is a shrink of the range of transcription rates for which it is present. The emerging picture is that, for a given transcription rate k_{R_1} , it is possible to tune the distribution of target R_1 from monomodal to bimodal and from expressed to repressed and viceversa via the expression of target R_2 .

The extrinsic noise makes it possible to obtain the same effect even in case of small

miRNA-target interaction on both targets. Figure 8 shows the case of a bimodal distribution on R_1 whose peaks can be tuned towards the repressed or the unrepressed case decreasing or increasing the expression of a second target R_2 . The two targets R_1 and R_2 are coupled through the noisy miRNA with small interaction strengths. These observations suggest that even if the miRNA repression is low and diluted over a network of multiple targets, the noisy environment makes cross-regulation among them possible at the population level.

DISCUSSION

Previous studies pointed out the relevance of extrinsic noise in molecular networks in shaping cell decision making and differentiation [1, 2]. Bimodal distributions of gene expression levels, that may be a feature of phenotypic differentiation, are a common phenomenon where the modes of the distribution correspond to different physiological states of the system [3–8]. In this work we addressed the role of extrinsic noise in shaping bimodal gene distributions in the context of miRNA-mediated regulation, both with stochastic modelling and simulations.

MiRNAs may induce bimodality in the expression of their target genes simply due to peculiar titrative interactions [14]. In a system with pure intrinsic noise, such bimodal distributions can be observed in condition of high miRNA-target interaction strength and for a small range of target transcription rates. Indeed, the binding and unbinding reactions between miRNA and target in condition of quasi-equimolarity let the target jump from the bound to the unbound state, giving rise to bimodal distributions. The bimodality is in this case a single cell phenomenon, that is every single cell can jump from one state to the other so that at a given time t part of the population will be “bound” and part “unbound”. We showed that introducing some extrinsic noise on the miRNA transcription (the miRNA transcription rate is randomly drawn from a gaussian distribution) it is possible to have a target bimodally expressed for a larger range of target transcription rates. In this case the bimodal distributions are a population phenomenon: there is a population of cells heterogeneous with respect to the miRNA amount and the bimodality results from the superposition of several monomodal distributions, each one obtained for a different value of miRNA transcription rate.

Interestingly, a high miRNA-target interaction strength is not necessary to obtain a

population-induced bimodal distribution. We showed that extrinsic noise and miRNA-target interaction strength act at similar levels with respect to the bimodality. The interaction strength between miRNA and target in our model takes into account possible different number of miRNA binding sites on the mRNA target sequence. Since the miRNA repression on a given target is usually small and possibly diluted over multiple targets, our results suggests that some extrinsic noise can compensate for a low interaction strength in order to obtain differentially expressed phenotypes.

Bimodal mRNA distributions may result in bimodal or monomodal protein distributions depending on the protein half-life. Long-lived proteins accumulate in time so that the corresponding mRNA unrepressed state is amplified while the repressed one is hidden. On the other hand, if the protein is short lived the regions of bimodality for proteins and transcripts are similar. Again, extrinsic noise increases the range of target transcription rates that allow bimodal protein distributions. This result suggests that single phenotypes at the level of proteins may be maintained robustly for proteins with long half-lives even if their corresponding mRNAs are bimodally distributed.

Since every single miRNA may have many different targets that in turn compete for the shared pool of miRNAs, a change in the expression level of one of them may alter the expression of the others. If one of this targets is bimodally distributed, then the bimodality may be influenced by the expression level of the other miRNA competitors. We modelled this case considering two targets in competition for the same miRNA and showed that cross-regulation is possible even in case of small miRNA-target interaction strength if some extrinsic noise is present. In particular, different targets may cross-regulate each other's bimodal distributions and their interplay is pivotal in stabilizing the presence of single phenotypes. This suggests that even if the miRNA repression is low and diluted over a network of multiple targets, the noisy environment makes cross-regulation among them possible.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Stochastic model for miRNA-target interaction with extrinsic noise

The equations governing the dynamics of the system considered in Figure 1 are given by:

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = k_R - g_R R - g R S \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = k_S - g_S S - g \alpha R S \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{dP}{dt} = k_P - g_P P, \quad (7)$$

where R, S and P are the concentrations of the three species involved in the circuit expressed in nanomolars.

Because of the inherent stochastic nature of molecular reactions, intrinsic noise should be taken into account by defining the probability distribution of observing $\underline{n} = (n_R, n_S, n_P)$ molecules at time t , namely $P(\underline{n}, t)$. The number of molecules of the species X , n_X , relates to the concentrations, ρ_X , as $n_X = V_{cell} \rho_X$. The dynamics of this system can be rewritten in terms of the master equation, that reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dP(\underline{n}, t)}{dt} = & k_R \left[P(n_R - 1, t) - P(\underline{n}, t) \right] + \\ & \frac{g_R}{V_{cell}} \left[(n_R + 1) P(n_R + 1, t) - n_R P(\underline{n}, t) \right] + \\ & k_S \left[P(n_S - 1, t) - P(\underline{n}, t) \right] + \\ & \frac{g_S}{V_{cell}} \left[(n_S + 1) P(n_S + 1, t) - n_S P(\underline{n}, t) \right] + \\ & \frac{k_P n_R}{V_{cell}} \left[P(n_P - 1, t) - P(\underline{n}, t) \right] + \\ & \frac{g_P}{V_{cell}} \left[(n_P + 1) P(n_P + 1, t) - n_P P(\underline{n}, t) \right] + \\ & \frac{g \alpha}{V_{cell}^2} \left[(n_S + 1)(n_R + 1) P(n_R + 1, n_S + 1, t) - n_S n_R P(\underline{n}, t) \right] + \\ & \frac{g(1 - \alpha) n_S}{V_{cell}^2} \left[(n_R + 1) P(n_R + 1, t) - n_R P(\underline{n}, t) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Solving the master equation or even only determining the first and second moments of $P(\underline{n}, t)$ might be a difficult task due to the non-linear terms appearing from the miRNA-mRNA interactions. It is common practice to refer to approximations, amongst all the van Kampen's system-size expansion.

The van Kampen's system-size expansion relies on the assumption that the number of molecules of any species X can be split into two contributions, the former coming from the deterministic system and the latter from the intrinsic noise in the system, namely:

$$n_X = V_{cell} \rho_X + V_{cell}^{1/2} \xi_X, \quad (9)$$

where ξ_X is a gaussian-distributed variable with zero average. The cell volume, V_{cell} , represents the system size and it is assumed to be sufficiently large. Rewriting the master equation by using Eq. 9, at the leading order in V_{cell} one finds the probability distribution to be a Dirac's delta in terms of the number of molecules, therefore recovering the deterministic equations Eqs.7. The next-to-leading order in the expansion instead leads to a linear Fokker-Planck like equation in terms of the noisy variables $\{\xi_X\}$, the probability distribution of the number of molecules then being gaussian centered around the deterministic concentrations ϕ_X and with finite variance. By using this equation, one can compute the variances and the cross-correlations of the noisy variables, namely $\langle \xi_X^2 \rangle$ and $\langle \xi_X \xi_Y \rangle$ that can be related to the molecules' variances and cross-correlations.

In the specific case of the circuit we analysed, the variances and cross-correlations are steady-state solutions of the following system:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \dot{\xi}_R^2 \rangle &= k_r - 2g_r \langle \xi_R^2 \rangle + g_r R - 2\alpha g R \langle \xi_S \xi_R \rangle - 2\alpha g S \langle \xi_R^2 \rangle + \\
&\alpha g S R - 2(1 - \alpha) g S \langle \xi_R^2 \rangle + (1 - \alpha) g R S - 2(1 - \alpha) g R \langle \xi_S \xi_R \rangle \\
\langle \dot{\xi}_S^2 \rangle &= k_s - 2g_s \langle \xi_S^2 \rangle + g_s S - 2\alpha g R \langle \xi_S^2 \rangle - 2\alpha g S \langle \xi_S \xi_R \rangle + \alpha g R S \\
\langle \dot{\xi}_P^2 \rangle &= k_p R - 2g_p \langle \xi_P^2 \rangle + g_p P + 2k_p \langle \xi_P \xi_R \rangle \\
\langle \dot{\xi}_R \xi_S \rangle &= -g_r \langle \xi_S \xi_R \rangle - g_s \langle \xi_S \xi_R \rangle - \alpha g R \langle \xi_S^2 \rangle - \alpha g S \langle \xi_S \xi_R \rangle - \\
&\alpha g R \langle \xi_S \xi_R \rangle - \alpha g S \langle \xi_R^2 \rangle + R S \alpha g - (1 - \alpha) g S \langle \xi_S \xi_R \rangle - \\
&(1 - \alpha) g R \langle \xi_S^2 \rangle \\
\langle \dot{\xi}_R \xi_P \rangle &= -g_P \langle \xi_P \xi_R \rangle + k_P \langle \xi_R^2 \rangle - \alpha g R \langle \xi_P \xi_S \rangle - \alpha g S \langle \xi_P \xi_R \rangle - \\
&(1 - \alpha) g S \langle \xi_P \xi_R \rangle - (1 - \alpha) g R \langle \xi_P \xi_S \rangle - g_r \langle \xi_P \xi_R \rangle \\
\langle \dot{\xi}_S \xi_P \rangle &= -g_P \langle \xi_P \xi_S \rangle - g_s \langle \xi_P \xi_S \rangle + k_P \langle \xi_S \xi_R \rangle - \alpha g R \langle \xi_P \xi_S \rangle - \\
&\alpha g S \langle \xi_P \xi_R \rangle .
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Using the expressions obtained from the previous system, specifying all the parameters, one can compute the probability distribution of the system, $P(\underline{n}, t)$ and the Pearson's correlation coefficient between species X and Y , namely $\rho_{XY} = \frac{\langle n_X n_Y \rangle - \langle n_X \rangle \langle n_Y \rangle}{\sigma_X \sigma_Y}$.

To investigate the role of environmental fluctuations (i.e. extrinsic noise) in our system of interest, we consider a fluctuating rate of miRNA production k_S . For the sake of simplicity, we assume this parameter to be drawn from a gaussian distribution, $P(k_S) =$

$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sigma_{k_S}^2}} e^{-\frac{(k_S - \langle k_S \rangle)^2}{2\sigma_{k_S}^2}}$, where $\langle k_S \rangle$ and σ_{k_S} are respectively the average and variance of k_S .

Due to the further stochasticity introduced by the extrinsic noise, the master equation previously derived does not hold anymore. Fluctuations on the parameter k_S do not allow to rewrite a similar equation for this system in a simple way. However, as also shown in [?], the probability distribution of the entire system, $P(\underline{n})$ can be rewritten in terms of conditional probabilities by using the Bayes' theorem in the following way:

$$P(\underline{n}) = \int P(k_S) P(\underline{n}|k_S) dk_S, \quad (11)$$

where $P(k_S)$ is the gaussian distribution in k_S and $P(\underline{n}|k_S)$ is the conditioned probability of observing a certain configuration of the system, $\underline{n}$, given a specific value of k_S . This probability distribution is solution of the master equation Eq. 10 for any given k_S . One can therefore apply again the van Kampen's expansion on the master equation of $P(\underline{n}|k_S)$ and obtain all the moments of this distribution (that will be all functions of the fluctuating parameter k_S). The full solution can be obtained by averaging the result over all the values of k_S .

Molecular simulations of microRNA mediated circuits via the Gillespie's algorithm

Stochastic simulations have been performed via implementation of the Gillespie's direct algorithm [32]. All the results presented in this paper are obtained at the steady state.

I. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Chiara Enrico Bena, Raffaele Marino, Andrea De Martino and Andrea Pagnani for useful discussions. Silvia Grigolon would like to thank the Francis Crick Institute which receives its core funding from Cancer Research UK, the UK Medical Research Council, and the Wellcome Trust.

-
- [1] PS Swain, MB Elowitz, and ED Siggia. Intrinsic and extrinsic contributions to stochasticity in gene expression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*

- America*, 99 (20):12795 – 12800, 2002.
- [2] V Shahrezaei, JF Ollivier, and PS Swain. Colored extrinsic fluctuations and stochastic gene expression. *Mol Syst Biol*, 4:196, 2008.
 - [3] Marina Bessarabova, Eugene Kirillov, Weiwei Shi, Andrej Bugrim, Yuri Nikolsky, and Tatiana Nikolskaya. Bimodal gene expression patterns in breast cancer. *BMC Genomics*, 11(Suppl I): S8, 2010.
 - [4] Alex K Shalek, Rahul Satija, Xian Adiconis, Rona S Gertner, Jellert T Gaublonne, Raktima Raychowdhury, Schraga Schwartz, Nir Yosef, Christine Malboeuf, Diana Lu, John J Trombetta, Dave Gennert, Andreas Gnirke, Alon Goren, Nir Hacohen, Joshua Z Levin, Hongkun Park, and Aviv Regev. Single-cell transcriptomics reveals bimodality in expression and splicing in immune cells. *Nature*, 498:236–240, 2013.
 - [5] Y Nikolsky, E Kirillov, T Serebryiskaya, R Rakhmatulin, A Perlina, A Bugrim, W Lingle, and T Nikolskaya. Sequential clustering of breast cancers using bimodal gene expression. *Proceed AACR Ann Meeting*, page 141, 2007.
 - [6] I Dozmorov, N Knowlton, Y Tang, A Shields, P Pathipvanich, JN Jarvis, and M Centola. Hypervariable genes—experimental error or hidden dynamics. *Nucleic Acids Res*, 32 (19):e147–10, 2004.
 - [7] HY Zhao, PY Yue, and KT Fang. Identification of differentially expressed genes with multivariate outlier analysis. *J Biopharm Stat*, 14 (3):629–646, 2004.
 - [8] AE Teschendorff, A Naderi, NL Barbosa-Morais, and C Caldas. Pack: Profile analysis using clustering and kurtosis to find molecular classifiers in cancer. *Bioinformatics*, 22 (18):2269–2275, 2006.
 - [9] P Bu, , KY Chen, JH Chen, L Wang, J Walters, YJ Shin, JP Goerger, J Sun, M Witherspoon, N Rakhilin, J Li, H Yang, J Milsom, S Lee, W Zipfel, MM Jin, ZH Gumus, SM Lipkin, and X Shen. A microRNA mir-34a-regulated bimodal switch targets notch in colon cancer stem cells. *Cell Stem Cell*, 12 (5):602 – 615, 2013.
 - [10] C Bosia, F Sgró, L Conti, C Baldassi, D Brusa, F Cavallo, F Di Cunto, E Turco, A Pagnani, and R Zecchina. Quantitative study of crossregulation, noise and synchronization between microRNA targets in single cells. *arXiv:1503.06696*, 2015.
 - [11] DP Bartel. MicroRNAs: genomics, biogenesis, mechanism, and function. *Cell*, 116:281– 297, 2004.

- [12] AS Flynt and EC Lai. Biological principles of microRNA-mediated regulation: shared themes amid diversity. *Nat Rev Genet*, 9:831– 842, 2008.
- [13] DP Bartel. Micrnas: target recognition and regulatory functions. *Cell*, 136:215 – 233, 2009.
- [14] C Bosia, A Pagnani, and R Zecchina. Modelling competing endogenous rna networks. *PLoS One*, 8(6):e66609, 2013.
- [15] S Mukherji, MS Ebert, GX Zheng, JS Tsang, PA Sharp, and A van Oudenaarden. Micrnas can generate thresholds in target gene expression. *Nat Genet*, 43(9):854–859, 2011.
- [16] M Figliuzzi, E Marinari, and A De Martino. Micrnas as a selective channel of communication between competing rnas: a steady-state theory. *Biophysical Journal*, 104(5):1203–1213, 2013.
- [17] RC Friedman, KK-H Farh, CB Burge, and Bartel DP. Most mammalian mrnas are conserved targets of micrnas. *Genome Res.*, 19:92 – 105, 2009.
- [18] H-W Hwang and JT Mendell. Micrnas in cell proliferation, cell death, and tumorigenesis. *Br. J. Cancer*, 94:776 – 780, 2006.
- [19] M Inui, G Martello, and S Piccolo. Micrna control of signal transduction. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.*, 11:252 – 263, 2010.
- [20] A Esquela-Kerscher and FJ Slack. Oncomirs: micrnas with a role in cancer. *Nat. Rev. Cancer*, 6:259 – 269, 2006.
- [21] R Garzon, GA Calin, and CM Croce. Micrnas in cancer. *Annu. Rev. Med.*, 60:167 – 179, 2009.
- [22] JT Mendell and EN Olson. Micrnas in stress signaling and human disease. *Cell*, 148:1172 – 1187, 2012.
- [23] SP Nana-Sinkam and CM Croce. Clinical applications for micrnas in cancer. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.*, 93:98–104, 2013.
- [24] MT Pickering, BM Stadler, and TF Kowalik. mir-17 and mir-20a temper an e2f1-induced g1 checkpoint to regulate cell cycle progression. *Oncogene*, 28(1):140–145, 2009.
- [25] HI Trompeter, H Abbad, KM Iwaniuk, M Hafner, N Renwick, T Tuschl, J Schira, HW Muller, and P Wernet. Micrnas mir-17, mir-20a, and mir-106b act in concert to modulate e2f activity on cell cycle arrest during neuronal lineage differentiation of ussc. *PLoS One*, 6(1):e16138, 2011.
- [26] Y Zhang, T Han, G Wei, and Y Wang. Inhibition of microRNA-17/20a suppresses cell proliferation in gastric cancer by modulating ube2c expression. *Oncol Rep.*, 33(5):2529–2536,

- 2015.
- [27] W Zhuo, W Ge, G Meng, S Jia, X Zhou, and J Liu. Microrna 20a promotes the proliferation and cell cycle of human osteosarcoma cells by suppressing early growth response 2 expression. *Mol Med Rep*, 12 (4):4989 – 4994, 2015.
 - [28] JY Zhou, WL Ma, S Liang, Y Zeng, R Shi, HL Yu, WW Xiao, and WL Zheng. Analysis of microrna expression profiles during the cell cycle in synchronized hela cells. *BMB Rep*, 42(9):593–598, 2009.
 - [29] U Ala, F Karreth, C Bosia, A Pagnani, R Taulli, V Léopold, Y Tay, P Provero, R Zecchina, and PP Pandolfi. Integrated transcriptional and competitive endogenous rna networks are cross-regulated in permissive molecular environments. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 110(18):7154–7159, 2013.
 - [30] M Osella, C Bosia, D Corá, and M Caselle. The role of incoherent microrna-mediated feed-forward loops in noise buffering. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 7(3):e1001101, 2011.
 - [31] S Grigolon, F Di Patti, A De Martino, and E Marinari. Noise processing by microrna-mediated circuits: The incoherent feed-forward loop, revisited. *Heliyon*, 2(4):e00095, 2016.
 - [32] D Gillespie. A general method for numerically simulating the stochastic time evolution of coupled chemical reactions. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 22:403 – 434, 1976.






Figure 1: **Model and steady state trajectories.** The reference circuits (without and with extrinsic noise on the miRNA transcription rate) are represented in (A) and (C) respectively with the rates considered in the model. k_R and k_S are the target mRNA and miRNA transcription rates, g_R and g_S are respectively the mRNA and miRNA degradation rates. k_P is the protein translation rate and g_P is its degradation rate. g is the miRNA-target interaction strength and α is the fraction of miRNAs that are recycled after binding to the mRNA. In panels (B) and (D) there are three different trajectories for the mRNA, corresponding to the model on the left. For both panels, the steady state distributions of the number of free mRNA molecules are bimodal. In (B) the parameters are $k_S = 0.05s^{-1}$, $k_R = 0.112s^{-1}$, $g_S = 0.0002s^{-1}$, $g_R = 0.0004s^{-1}$, $g = 0.0100s^{-1}$, $k_P = 0.1s^{-1}$, $g_P = 0.0002s^{-1}$ and $\alpha = 0.5$. In (D) the parameters are $k_R = 0.13s^{-1}$, $g_S = 0.0002s^{-1}$, $g_R = 0.0004s^{-1}$, $g = 0.0008s^{-1}$, $k_P = 0.1s^{-1}$, $g_P = 0.0002s^{-1}$ and $\alpha = 0.5$. k_S are picked from a gaussian distribution with mean $\bar{k}_S = 0.05s^{-1}$ and standard deviation $\sigma = 0.01s^{-1}$.


(A) miRNA production rate distributions



(B) mRNA mean



(C) free mRNA molecules distributions



(D) protein molecules distributions




Figure 2: **Emergence of bimodality in presence of extrinsic noise.** (A) Qualitative representation of the miRNA production rate distribution. The black vertical line indicates the value of the miRNA transcription rate $k_S = \alpha k_R$ for different values of the target transcription rate k_R . The distributions represent the different regions labeled from 1 to 5 shown in (B). The region of the distribution contributing to the repressed state is colored in orange. (B) Free mRNA molecules amount as a function of the target transcription rate k_R . Solid lines are analytical predictions while blue squares correspond to numerical simulations. (C) Free mRNA molecules distributions corresponding to the regions in (B). Solid black lines correspond to numerical simulations while solid red lines are analytical predictions. The repressed region is colored in orange. (D) Protein molecules distributions corresponding to the mRNA distributions in (C). Solid black lines correspond to numerical simulations while solid red lines are analytical predictions. The repressed region is colored in orange. In (B) the parameters are $g_S = 0.0002s^{-1}$ $g_R = 0.0004s^{-1}$ $g = 0.0008s^{-1}$ $k_P = 0.1s^{-1}$ $g_P = 0.0002s^{-1}$ $\alpha = 0.5$. k_S are picked from a gaussian distribution with mean $\bar{k}_S = 0.05s^{-1}$ and standard deviation $\sigma = 0.02s^{-1}$. k_R ranges from $0.01s^{-1}$ to $0.22s^{-1}$. In (C) and (D) the parameters are the same as in (B) except for k_R that is fixed for each distribution and from region 1 to 5 takes the values $k_R = 0.05s^{-1}$, $0.13s^{-1}$, $0.17s^{-1}$, $0.19s^{-1}$, $0.22s^{-1}$.




Figure 3: **Phase diagram for bimodality in the free mRNA molecules distribution.** On the x axes there is the target transcription rate k_R , on the y axes the extrinsic noise on the miRNA transcription rate. The color map indicates the presence of bimodality for different values of the miRNA-target interaction strength g . The width of the bimodality range increases as the interaction strength or the extrinsic noise are increased. The phase diagram is the result of a series of simulations in which the presence of bimodality was checked manually. The following parameters are equal for all the simulations: $g_S = 0.0002s^{-1}$, $g_R = 0.0004s^{-1}$, $k_P = 0.1s^{-1}$, $g_P = 0.0002s^{-1}$, $\alpha = 0.5$. target mRNA transcription rate is one of the control parameters and ranges from $k_R = 0.10s^{-1}$ to $k_R = 0.24s^{-1}$. miRNA-mRNA association rate is one of the control parameters and takes the following values: $g = 0.0008s^{-1}$ $0.0020s^{-1}$ $0.0032s^{-1}$ $0.0064s^{-1}$. Extrinsic noise is tuned by varying the standard deviation of the distribution with mean $\bar{k}_S = 0.05s^{-1}$ from which miRNA transcription rates are picked, the standard deviation takes the following values: $\sigma = 0.000s^{-1}$ (no noise) $0.003s^{-1}$ $0.010s^{-1}$ $0.020s^{-1}$. To define the origin of the bimodality region for the case with $g = 0.0008s^{-1}$ the value $\sigma = 0.005s^{-1}$ was also used.




Figure 4: **Comparison between the bimodal mRNA noisy distribution and the weighted superposition of distributions obtained without noise for different miRNA transcription rates.** The parameters are the following: $k_R = 0.13s^{-1}$, $g_S = 0.0002s^{-1}$, $g_R = 0.0004s^{-1}$, $g = 0.0008s^{-1}$, $k_P = 0.1s^{-1}$, $g_P = 0.0002s^{-1}$ and $\alpha = 0.5$. In the main plot the different mRNA distributions correspond, from left to right, to $k_S = 0.07s^{-1}, 0.06s^{-1}, 0.05s^{-1}, 0.04s^{-1}, 0.03s^{-1}$. In the inset, the mRNA histogram is the result of miRNA transcription rates picked from a gaussian distribution with mean $\bar{k}_S = 0.05s^{-1}$ and standard deviation $\sigma = 0.01s^{-1}$. The black line is the result of the weighted superposition of the distributions represented in the main plot.




Figure 5: **Extrinsic noise may compensate for low miRNA-target interaction to maintain different phenotypes.** Similar bimodal distributions are obtained either increasing the miRNA-target interaction strength (blue histogram) or increasing the extrinsic noise (orange histogram) with respect to a reference distribution with no extrinsic noise and low miRNA-target interaction strength (black histogram). The parameters are the following: $k_R = 0.114s^{-1}$, $g_S = 0.0002s^{-1}$, $g_R = 0.0004s^{-1}$, $k_P = 0.1s^{-1}$, $g_P = 0.0002s^{-1}$, $\alpha = 0.5$. High and low miRNA-target interaction strength correspond to $g = 0.0075s^{-1}$ and $g = 0.0025s^{-1}$ respectively. The miRNA transcription rate is $k_S = 0.05s^{-1}$ for the case without extrinsic noise (orange and black histograms) while different values are picked from a gaussian distribution with mean $\bar{k}_S = 0.05s^{-1}$ and standard deviation $\sigma = 0.0033s^{-1}$ for the case with extrinsic noise (blue histogram).




Figure 6: **Protein half-life buffers bimodal phenotypes.** (A) mRNA distributions with (blue) and without (red) extrinsic noise for the same set of parameters: $k_R = 0.115s^{-1}$, $g_S = 0.0002s^{-1}$, $g_R = 0.0004s^{-1}$ and $\alpha = 0.5$. The miRNA transcription rates for the case with extrinsic noise are picked from a gaussian distribution with mean $\bar{k}_S = 0.05s^{-1}$ and standard deviation $\sigma = 0.003s^{-1}$. For the case without extrinsic noise the miRNA transcription rate is $k_S = 0.05s^{-1}$. (B) Distributions for the corresponding proteins. Blue and red histograms correspond to the cases with and without extrinsic noise respectively, with protein degradation rate $g_P = 0.0008s^{-1}$ (long-lived protein). In yellow there is the distribution for the short-lived protein (with degradation rate $g_P = 0.0032s^{-1}$) corresponding to the noisy mRNA distribution.




Figure 7: **Model of competition between two targets of the same miRNA.**

Reference circuit including extrinsic noise for the case of two genes competing for the same miRNA. k_S is the miRNA transcription rate. k_{R1} and k_{R2} are the transcription rates of target 1 and 2 respectively. g_{R1} and g_{R2} are the mRNA degradation rates of target 1 and 2 respectively. k_{P1} and k_{P2} are the translation rates of protein 1 and 2 respectively. g_{P1} and g_{P2} are the degradation rates of protein 1 and 2 respectively. g_1 and g_2 are the miRNA interaction rates with target 1 and 2 respectively. α is the fraction of miRNAs that are recycled after binding to the mRNAs.




Figure 8: **A change in the expression of one target can make the other one collapse into a repressed or unrepressed state.** Starting from a bimodal distribution on target 1 (blue histogram), a decrease in the expression of a second target can bring the first one to the repressed state (orange histogram). Similarly, an increase in the expression of the second target induces the first one to be in an unrepressed state (red histogram).

The parameters are the following: $k_{R1} = 0.11s^{-1}$, $g_S = 0.0002s^{-1}$, $g_{R1} = 0.0004s^{-1}$, $g_{R2} = 0.0004s^{-1}$, $k_{P1} = 0.1s^{-1}$, $k_{P2} = 0.1s^{-1}$, $g_{P1} = 0.0002s^{-1}$, $g_{P2} = 0.0002s^{-1}$, $\alpha = 0.5$, $g1 = 0.0008s^{-1}$, $g2 = 0.0002s^{-1}$. k_{R2} takes the value $0.02s^{-1}$ (blue histogram), $0.002s^{-1}$ (orange histogram) and $0.04s^{-1}$ (red histogram). k_S are picked from a gaussian distribution with mean $\bar{k}_S = 0.05s^{-1}$ and standard deviation $\sigma = 0.01s^{-1}$.